

SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress
1st Session

Vote No. 456

September 21, 1995, 6:30 p.m.
Page S-14049 Temp. Record

FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATIONS/No UNFPA Funds if in China

SUBJECT: Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1996 . .
. H.R. 1868. Helms amendment No. 2730 to the committee amendment on pages 44-45.

ACTION: AMENDMENT REJECTED, 43-57

SYNOPSIS: As reported, H.R. 1868, the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1996, will provide a total of \$12.34 billion in new budget authority for foreign aid programs in fiscal year (FY) 1996. This is \$2.43 billion below the President's request, and \$1.19 billion below the FY 1995 appropriated amount.

The committee amendment on pages 44-45 would enact provisions on funding for the United Nations Population Fund.

The Helms amendment would add the following: "Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or other law, none of the funds appropriated by this Act may be made available for the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), unless the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that (1) the United Nations Population Fund has terminated all activities in the People's Republic of China; or (2) during the 12 months preceding such certification, there have been no abortions as the result of coercion associated with the family planning policies of the national government or other governmental entities within the People's Republic of China. As used in this section the term "coercion" includes physical duress or abuse, destruction or confiscation of property, loss of means of livelihood, or severe psychological pressure."

Those favoring the amendment contended:

During the 1980s and early 1990s, Presidents Reagan and Bush blocked U.S. funding for the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) because of its enthusiastic support for China's population control program. That program was designed by the UNFPA, and was, and is, still held up as a model by the UNFPA for the rest of the world to follow. Funding was blocked because under that program China forces women to have abortions and sterilizes men and women against their will in order to enforce its one-child-per-family policy. Presidents Reagan and Bush derived their authority to take that action from a provision which has been

(See other side)

YEAS (43)			NAYS (57)			NOT VOTING (0)	
Republicans (40 or 74%)		Democrats (3 or 7%)	Republicans (14 or 26%)		Democrats (43 or 93%)	Republicans (0)	Democrats (0)
Abraham	Hatch	Biden	Brown	Akaka	Johnston		
Ashcroft	Helms	Breaux	Campbell	Baucus	Kennedy		
Bennett	Hutchison	Heflin	Chafee	Bingaman	Kerrey		
Bond	Inhofe		Cohen	Boxer	Kerry		
Burns	Kempthorne		Hatfield	Bradley	Kohl		
Coats	Kyl		Jeffords	Bryan	Lautenberg		
Cochran	Lott		Kassebaum	Bumpers	Leahy		
Coverdell	Lugar		Packwood	Byrd	Levin		
Craig	Mack		Roth	Conrad	Lieberman		
D'Amato	McCain		Simpson	Daschle	Mikulski		
DeWine	McConnell		Snowe	Dodd	Moseley-Braun		
Dole	Murkowski		Specter	Dorgan	Moynihan		
Domenici	Nickles		Stevens	Exon	Murray		
Faircloth	Pressler		Thomas	Feingold	Nunn		
Frist	Santorum			Feinstein	Pell		
Gorton	Shelby			Ford	Pryor		
Gramm	Smith			Glenn	Reid		
Grams	Thompson			Graham	Robb		
Grassley	Thurmond			Harkin	Rockefeller		
Gregg	Warner			Hollings	Sarbanes		
				Inouye	Simon		
					Wellstone		

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

- 1—Official Business
- 2—Necessarily Absent
- 3—Illness
- 4—Other

SYMBOLS:

- AY—Announced Yea
- AN—Announced Nay
- PY—Paired Yea
- PN—Paired Nay

in every foreign aid appropriations bill since 1985. That provision forbids funding of any "organization or program which, as determined by the President of the United States, supports or participates in the management of a program of coercive abortion or involuntary sterilization." As soon as President Clinton was elected, he proclaimed that China was not engaged in these inhuman, evil practices, and he therefore resumed funding for the UNFPA. President Clinton's proclamation was hailed by many of our colleagues who, along with the President, were unwilling to acknowledge that China was guilty.

We hear few claims today that China is not guilty. The evidence is so overwhelming that Senators, and even President Clinton, can no longer deny it. Instead, our colleagues now offer faint condemnations, while at the same time they continue to sign praises for the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA). Our colleagues are much happier talking about the ends rather than the unspeakably cruel means with which they have been achieved. Those ends are hardly the point. Senators may prattle on with all the dark, Malthusian predictions that they wish, and they may make all their arguments about how wonderful it would be for everybody if we could only convince people that it is better to go forth and divide instead of multiply, but those arguments have nothing whatsoever to do with this debate.

This debate is not over the merits of the end, but the means with which it is being achieved. The UNFPA continues to support China's program, and it continues to provide funding. By definition, it is therefore ineligible for U.S. funding. The ban on funding organizations that support or fund programs of coerced abortions and involuntary sterilizations does not simply block funding for those organizations' direct involvement in those activities; it blocks all funds. Our colleagues ignore this point, and tell us that our contribution to the UNFPA will not be used in China. However, money is fungible; if we give the UNFPA money to spend in countries that do not have coercive abortion and sterilization policies, it will free up more resources for the UNFPA to spend in China on its favorite program. We are not in favor of freeing up resources so that the UNFPA can be more active in China. We therefore strongly support the adoption of the Helms amendment.

Those opposing the amendment contended:

We share our colleagues' outrage over China's policy. However, we do not hold the UNFPA in any way responsible. In fact, the UNFPA's involvement in China, by providing high-quality family planning services, reduces the incidence of pregnancy and thus reduces the need to have abortions. Listening to our colleagues, one would think that the UNFPA is an abortion agency, but by its very charter it is not involved in abortions or abortion-related services. It is strictly a family-planning agency that is dedicated to preventing pregnancies from occurring in the first instance. This Congress seems intent on restricting a woman's right to choose; this amendment goes one step further, by trying to restrict family planning as well.

We will not take this giant step backwards for women's rights. Women around the world should have ready access to, and information on, methods for controlling their rates of reproduction. Having children at young ages, and having too many unwanted children, traps women and their children in lives of unrewarding poverty. Whole countries are destitute because of high fecundity rates. Soon, the whole world may be overwhelmed by the burgeoning world population. Unless it is brought under control, there will not be enough resources worldwide to care for everyone. Disease, famine, war, poverty, and total destruction of the environment will result.

The UNFPA has been working tirelessly to ward off this potential disaster, and it has had great successes. It is the largest family-planning provider in the world, providing vital services in over 140 countries. By its own charter, it is not involved in abortions, and by our law, our contributions to it are not used in China. The work of this organization should be supported with United States funds, because it is in the United States' interest to control world population growth. The Helms amendment is anti-family planning. We are not, and thus must oppose it.